

### REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the notification of allowable subject matter, i.e. that claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 28, 29, 34 and 35 are allowed and claims 11-14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The undersigned also wishes to thank Primary Examiner Coleman for the courtesy and helpful comments extended during their recent discussion of the application. During that discussion, it was indicated that the non-elected subject matter currently pending would be cancelled without prejudice to expedite allowance of the application. It was also discussed that the issues raised under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 112 as set forth on pages 6-7 of the Office Action are made in reference to the variable “m” and the discussion of the variable “n” in the Office Action is a typographical-type error.

A Power for Attorney (Revocation of prior powers) is enclosed herewith. Please change the correspondence address for this application to the address list on that Power.

The specification and claims 1 and 8 have been amended, claims 6, 7, 15-17, 19, 20, 26, 30, 31, 36 and 37 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 38 and 39 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments. For instance, support for new claims 38 and 39 appears in original claims 6 and 7. Support for the amendment of claim 1 and the specification is discussed below. Claim 8 has been amended to address a typographical-type matter. Applicants reserve all rights to pursue subject matters of the cancelled claims in suitable continuing application(s).

Claims 1, 24 and 32 are rejected as being drawn to an improper Markush group. The rejection is traversed.

As discussed with the Examiner, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite elected subject matter. Such amendments are believed to obviate the rejection.

The specification was objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 and claims 1, 10, 24, 25 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 on grounds of the recitation of 4-pyridylmethyl, 4-pyridylethyl and 4-imidazolylethyl in claim 1. The objection and rejection are traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that R<sup>7</sup> can be H, C<sub>1-4</sub> alkyl, pyridylmethyl, pyridylethyl, imidazolylethyl, among others.

In the application as filed, disclosed R<sup>7</sup> substituents include C<sub>1-4</sub>alkylpyridyl and C<sub>1-4</sub>alkylimidazolyl. See, for instance, the application at page 3, line 20. Additionally, more specific examples of those groups are disclosed generically and as species at page 10, lines 20-25, page 11, line 6, Example Ib-5 at page 51, Example Ib-6 at page 51, and Example Ib-8 at page 52 of the application.

Such disclosure clearly provides ample support for language recited in claim 1.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Bock et al. (U.S. Patent 5,834,464). The grounds for the rejection is a single species of Example 15. The rejection is traversed.

The Bock document is directed to certain urea compounds, i.e. compounds that contain a group of -NH-C(=O)-NH-. See, for instance, Bock at column 1 and 2 and the description of "R1" as well as the compound named at Example 15.

Applicants' claim 1 does not provide for a urea moiety positioned as described by Bock.

Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 on grounds of no statement of utility for the recited compounds.

Claims 6 and 7 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph on grounds of lack of utility.

For the sake of brevity, the two rejections are addressed in combination. As noted above, the Examiner indicated to the undersigned that these rejections are directed to the recitation of "m" rather than "n" in claims 6 and 7. The rejections are each traversed.

Claims 6 and 7 have been each cancelled without prejudice and claims 38 and 39 have been substituted therefor. Claims 38 and 39 do not recite that m is 2. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

Claims 6 and 7 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph on grounds that an upper case "M" was recited. New claims 38 and 39 do not recite an upper case "M", and it thus believed the rejection has been obviated.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)  
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
(617) 439-4444